REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 1 and 12-14 are amended by the present amendment. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification was objected to as failing to provide proper support for computer-readable medium recited in Claim 13; Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter; Claims 1, 2, and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,757,708 B1 to Craig et al. (hereafter Craig); and Claims 3-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Craig in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,681,298 B1 to Tso et al. (hereafter Tso).

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the specification and the rejection of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. First, Applicants note that the computer-readable medium is described at least on page 20, line 16 of the specification as "a magnetic storage device, optical disc, magnetic optical storage medium, semiconductor memory or the like." Further, because the computer-readable medium is clearly defined in the specification, Applicants traverse the assertion made by the Office Action that "one skilled in the art can interpret [Claim 13] as [drawn] to forms of energy." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification and the rejection of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

In response to the rejection of Claims 1 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Claims 1 and 12-14 are amended to recite features not taught or rendered obvious by the cited reference.

Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus connected with an external apparatus via a network. The information processing apparatus includes means for

transmitting a request for a page information to the external apparatus, and means for receiving the page information, wherein the page information includes an identification information corresponding to a content data. Further, the information processing apparatus includes means for storing the content data received by the means for receiving, based on the identification information independently of the page information. The information processing apparatus also includes means for outputting the content data along with the page information. Further, the information processing apparatus includes means for detecting whether the content data corresponding to the identification information is stored in the means for storing, and for controlling the means for outputting to output the content data stored by the means for storing ***without inquiry via the network when the content data is stored in the means for storing***, and for controlling the means for receiving to receive the content data from the external apparatus ***via the network when the content data is not stored in the means for storing***. Claims 12-14 are amended to recite similar features. Amended Claims 1 and 12-14 are supported at least by the original specification.[1] Thus, no new matter is added.

Turning now to the applied reference, Craig describes a system and a method for caching dynamic content. Craig describes that caching dynamically generated content creates issues more complex than with static content. Further, generation of dynamic content is typically much slower and more computationally expensive.[2] Therefore, Craig proposes an improved technique for caching dynamically generated content.[3] Craig describes an approach where a browser requests a JSP from a server to obtain dynamic content. A JSP is compiled into a servlet and resides on the server. Further, the JSP generates a dynamic page which includes the results of executing Java Beans. The execution of Java Beans is recognized to be an expensive process, thus Craig proposes "caching the Java Beans that are

[1] Pre-grant publication of Applicants' specification, paragraphs [0023], [0030], and [0032].
[2] Craig, column 1, lines 44-50.
[3] Craig, column 4, lines 9-11.

produced as a result of a JSP access, rather than trying to cache the generated data stream."[4] The solution described by Craig "seeks to avoid the cost of executing the business logic of the bean (that is, the logic that is executed upon invoking the beans 'execute' method), by using the previously-cached execution results which are stored as the bean's output properties."[5] As shown in Figure 4 of Craig, the caching approach stores execution results of bean 1 (element 425) in bean cache 430. It is clear that bean cache 430 resides on the server 400. Thus, when a client issues an http request (illustrated as element 405), this request and the subsequent reply are done over http and therefore over a network. Therefore, regardless of whether the results of executing bean 1 are cached in bean cache 430, the outputting of content requested by http request 405 **requires an inquiry via the network**.

This is however in contrast to Claim 1, which recites that the means for detecting controls the means for outputting to output the content data stored by the means for storing ***without inquiry via the network when the content data is stored in the means for storing,*** and controlling the means for receiving to receive the content data from the external apparatus ***via the network when the content data is not stored in the means for storing.*** Therefore, Craig fails to teach or suggest an information processing apparatus with all of the features recited in Claim 1. Claims 12-14 are amended to recite similar features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 12-14 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably define over Craig, and request that the rejection of Claims 1, 2, and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejections of dependent Claims 3-10, Applicants respectfully submit that Tso fails to cure the above deficiency of Craig. Tso is directed to an html cache system that stores entire html documents.[6] However, Tso fails to teach or suggest means for detecting that controls the means for outputting to output the content data stored by the means

[4] Craig, column 10, lines 41-43.
[5] Craig, column 10, line 67 to column 11, line 4.
[6] Tso, column 1, lines 44-47.

for storing without inquiry via the network when the content data is stored in the means for storing, and controlling the means for receiving to receive the content data from the external apparatus via the network when the content data is not stored in the means for storing. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 3-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early action favorable to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Kurt M. Berger

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Andrew T. Harry
Registration No. 56,959

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

I:\ATTY\GSD\28s\286664US\286664US_AM_DUE9.24.08.DOC

Kurt M. Berger, Ph.D.
Registration No. 51,461